



GP2020 COMMUNITY SUMMARIES

The following community summaries provide a brief synopsis of the population data, key issues and advisory group recommendations per community. Also included are community level land use distribution maps for each of the Planning and/or Sponsor Group areas.

► **Community
Summaries**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Community Planning Area (CPA) | Page |
|---|------------|
| Alpine..... | H-4, H-5 |
| Bonsall..... | H-6, H-7 |
| Borrego Springs & Desert Subregion..... | H-8, H-9 |
| CENTRAL MOUNTAIN | |
| Balance..... | H-10 |
| Cuyamaca..... | H-11 |
| Descanso..... | H-12 |
| Pine Valley..... | H-13 |
| County Islands..... | H-14 |
| Crest/Dehesa/Granite Hills/Harbison Canyon..... | H-15, H-16 |
| Fallbrook..... | H-17 |
| Jamul/Dulzura..... | H-18, H-19 |
| Julian..... | H-20 |
| Lakeside..... | H-21, H-22 |
| MOUNTAIN EMPIRE | |
| Balance..... | H-23 |
| Boulevard..... | H-24, H-25 |
| Jacumba..... | H-26 |
| Lake Morena/Campo..... | H-27 |
| Potrero..... | H-28 |
| Tecate..... | H-29 |
| NORTH COUNTY METROPOLITAN | |
| Balance..... | H-30, H-31 |
| Hidden Meadows..... | H-32 |
| Twin Oaks..... | H-33, H-34 |
| NORTH MOUNTAIN | |
| Balance..... | H-35 |
| Palomar Mountain..... | H-36 |
| Otay..... | H-37 |

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

Pala-Pauma..... H-38

Pendleton-DeLuz..... H-39

Rainbow..... H-40

Ramona..... H-41, H-42

San Dieguito..... H-43, H-44

Spring Valley..... H-45

Sweetwater..... H-46, H-47

Valle de Oro..... H-48

Valley Center..... H-49, H-50

ALPINE

Alpine Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 16,681

Community 2020 Target: 27,369

Working Copy Population: 30,200

Planning Commission Referrals: 7

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 17

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI). The Planning Group advances the idea of planning for private areas affected by FCI, which is due to sunset in 2010.
- GP2020 Population modeling/ methodology. The Planning Group does not agree with the GP2020 approach to forecasting population capacity and believes the area will never achieve the target numbers without additional planning for FCI-affected areas.
- Housing and Commercial/ Industrial Lands. The Planning Group requests that additional housing opportunities and commercial/industrial opportunities should be planned to support the Village.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village Core and Village densities and uses for the community are located in and around the historic Country Town center along Alpine Boulevard between Tavern Road and Cole Grade Road. Village areas extend to locations south of the town to reflect existing parcelization, schools, and traffic nodes (Tavern and South Grade). Growth would predominantly occur in the Village and Semi-Rural densities due to sewer availability in and adjacent to the Alpine Sanitation District. A moderate Village node has been introduced at the Interstate 8 and Dunbar Lane interchange in Blossom Valley per Staff and the Alpine Planning Group recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No formal Planning Group vote to date. The Alpine Planning Group Chairman, Mark Price, verbally supported the Working Copy – December 2002 map with further testing and revisions during the Planning Commission hearings.

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

- The Planning Group has requested that densities be applied in the FCI lands. This will be accomplished through the drafting of a Board Policy in concurrence with GP2020.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are primarily located within the Blossom Valley area.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement and review of the Commission referrals.

BONSALL

Bonsall Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 8,864

Community 2020 Target: 17,217

Working Copy Population: 13,850

Planning Commission Referrals: 2

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 14

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Traffic- regional traffic commuting through community.
- Maintaining rural character (agriculture, equestrian, and semi-rural densities).
- Impacts to community character from new development.
- Lack of code enforcement and local control.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- San Luis Rey River floodplain runs through the northern portion of the plan area and floodplains were designated at rural densities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- No major issues identified. The Sponsor Group supports the Working Copy – December 2002 map with further refinements including the following areas to be reviewed:
 - One area in the northern portion of the community (north of the River Village Shopping Center) is proposed by the Sponsor Group to be reduced in density from 10.9 du/ac (no specific designation given) due to slope and lack of access.
 - One area in the northern portion of the community (San Luis Rey Downs Race Track) is proposed to change from 14.5 du/ac to 1 du/2 ac due to its historical value and community character.
 - One area in the northeastern portion of the community (along W. Lilac Rd) is proposed to change from 1 du/4 ac to 1 du/10 ac due to the existing development pattern, lack of infrastructure, and proximity to agriculture. Interest Group is in support of this change.

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

- One area in the northeastern portion of the community (Dulin Ranch Specific Plan Area) is proposed to change to the density designations as adopted in the specific plan.
- One area in the western portion of the community (off the intersection of Old River Rd and SR-76) is proposed to change from commercial to 1 du/2 ac due to future plans by Caltrans to alter SR-76.
- One area in the southern portion of the community (Palisades Estates) is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/10 ac due to TM in process that would add future fire access for surrounding areas.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are located in the northern (former Dulin Ranch Specific Plan Area) and in the southwestern portion of the planning area.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

BORREGO SPRINGS AND THE DESERT SUBREGION

Borrego Springs Community Planning Area and Desert Subregion

2000 Census Population: 3, 190

Community 2020 Target: 37, 871

Working Copy Population: 15, 150

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 17

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- The Subregion is completely groundwater dependent. In terms of Borrego Springs, the entire valley is reliant on one aquifer.
- Significantly more water is taken out of the aquifer than is replenished.
- Disproportionate water usage. High water users in the Borrego valley include agriculture along with golf courses and commercial landscaping. Combined, this accounts for approximately 90% of the valley's annual water use.
- Difficulty accessing private in-holdings within the State Park.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Although this community is outside the CWA boundary, sewer and water service are available through the local water district. This district is dependent upon groundwater.
- Infrastructure (including schools, parks, library, fire and police protection) exists in the community of Borrego Springs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- With the intent of providing greater flexibility for agricultural landowners, the Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group and many of the citizens of Borrego Springs have recommend changing the 1du/20 acres area to 1du/4 acres.
- The Borrego Springs Community Sponsor Group, the Interest Group, and Staff agree on the remaining land use distribution pattern.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission has referred the groundwater issue and it's relationship to population density to staff for further analysis and collaboration with the community.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

CENTRAL MOUNTAIN
Central Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 7

Community 2020 Target: ---

Working Copy Population: 150

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 0

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Preserve the environment.
- Retain the existing setting and rural atmosphere.
- Protect regionally significant resources.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Low densities (1/80) have been applied to Forest Conservation Initiative lands. No density applied to lands considered “No Jurisdiction” (tribal lands, public lands).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ subarea does not include group quarters

CUYAMACA
Cuyamaca Community Sponsor Group Area

2000 Census Population: 377

Community 2020 Target: 680

Working Copy Population¹: 600

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 17

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Preserve and maintain the environment and open space.
- Preserve rural quality of life.
- Protect regionally significant resources.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Rural areas dominate the subregion. Approximately 95% of the subregion is comprised of the Cuyamaca Rancho State Park or the Cleveland National Forest.
- Low densities applied to lands affected by the Forest Conservation Initiative.
- Large parcel sizes surrounded by public land determined low-density patterns.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- The Cuyamaca Sponsor Group chair, Kathy Goddard, verbally supported the Working Copy map at the Planning Commission for further testing and revisions. The Group has not taken a formal vote.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

DESCANSO
Descanso Community Planning Group Area

2000 Census Population¹: 1,742

Community 2020 Target: 2,274

Working Copy Population: 2,800

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 14

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Provide adequate access to open space.
- Encourage the preservation of a rural character, ranchlands.
- Maintain an agricultural/ranching lifestyle.
- Preserve environmental resources.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Defined Village boundary. All lands outside of this are covered by Forest Conservation Initiative.
- Lack of water is an issue in the community and has been recognized by assigning lower densities.
- Low densities applied to lands affected by the Forest Conservation Initiative.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No formal proposal to date. However, the Planning Group would like to retain their existing general plan densities.

Planning Commission:

- The Merigan Ranch property has been referred back to Staff for further analysis.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

PINE VALLEY

Pine Valley Community Planning Group Area

2000 Census Population: 2,329

Community 2020 Target: 3,613

Working Copy Population: 2,700

Planning Commission Referrals: 2

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 14

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Limit traffic on circulation routes.
- Maintain the rural character of the subregion.
- Preserve environmental resources (wildlife, forest lands, trails, and open space).

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Lack of water is an issue in the community and has been recognized by assigning lower densities to undeveloped parcels.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- No formal recommendation.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are comprised of two areas for staff to review. The proposed Pine Creek Ranch area is located adjacent to the country town. Lucas Ranch is located in the northeast portion of the subregion, in proximity to Sunrise Highway.
- The Planning Commission has referred the groundwater issue and it's relationship to population density to staff for further analysis and collaboration with the community.

COUNTY ISLANDS
County Islands Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 1,986

Community 2020 Target: 2,130

Working Copy Population: 3,150

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 1

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining existing community character.
- Concerned with attempts of annexation by surrounding city (National City).

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Added growth reflects the existing land uses and patterns of development, proximity to existing infrastructure and freeways, and adjacency to incorporated cities.
- In light of the built out nature of the community of Lincoln Acres, large, vacant parcels with development potential were the only areas given a density increase.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

CREST/DEHESA/HARBISON CANYON/GRANITE HILLS

Crest/Dehesa/Harbison Canyon/Granite Hills Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 9,426

Community 2020 Target: 12,000

Working Copy Population: 11,000

Planning Commission Referrals: 6

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 4

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Traffic – speeding issues on wider roads and poorly engineered private roads.
- Impacts to community character from Sycuan Casino – traffic, visual façade, lighting and groundwater concerns.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character. Incompatible development in neighboring City of El Cajon – higher density.
- Concern over decreasing groundwater and high concentration of nitrates.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Environmentally sensitive areas including major Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) habitat corridors and resources such as the Sweetwater River.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No formal action has been taken on the overall map, but the following areas are recommended for modification:
 - One area in the central portion of the community (adjacent to Crest) is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/2 ac due to public request and adjacency to existing development pattern.
 - One area in the most northern portion of the community is proposed to change from 1 du/40 ac to a designation that is not in conflict with the tentative map in process.
 - One area in the northern portion is proposed to change from 1 du/40 ac to 1 du/4 ac. The slope dependent category is consistent with the existing general plan designation.
 - One area adjacent to the Crest Country Town to the north is proposed to change from 1 du/20 ac to 1 du/2 ac.

Planning Commission:

- Three of the above-referenced recommendations were referred to staff. Two referrals are located in the northern portion of the plan area. One is located in the area between the Crest County Town and Singing Hills Specific Plan Area.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

FALLBROOK
Fallbrook Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 39,585

Community 2020 Target: 50,000

Working Copy Population: 62,150

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 6

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Traffic congestion, especially through town center.
- Impacts to small town community character from population growth and development.
- Preserving community character and the environment while protecting private property interests.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- A large area, northeast of the interchange between SR-76 and I-15, has been designated as a possible employment center accompanied by residential designations to accommodate multifamily housing.
- The Santa Margarita and San Luis Rey Rivers are located to the North and South.
- The community contains a well-defined Village area with a portion located in an existing revitalization area.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No formal Planning Group vote to date. The Fallbrook Planning Group Chairman, Jim Russell, expressed his personal support of the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions during the Planning Commission hearings.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

JAMUL/DULZURA
Jamul/Dulzura Community Planning Group Area

2000 Census Population: 9,208

Community 2020 Target: 18,641

Working Copy Population: 22,550

Planning Commission Referrals: 4

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 12

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining historical character.
- Maintaining the rural character of the subregion.
- Preserving environmental resources.
- Traffic/ border issues.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- No Village Core densities exist within the subregion. The community utilizes adjacent Valle de Oro Village Core area as their commercial center.
- Transitioning of development away from the village was key to establishing a pattern of development within the County Water Authority area of the subregion.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The group would like to investigate “groundtruthing” of actual buildable land within the subregion before making a formal recommendation. Based upon the topography of the land to the east of the County Water Authority, the Jamul/Dulzura Planning Group believe that higher densities are not possible, and with the Resource Protection Ordinance and Groundwater Ordinance in place, it is not necessary to assign densities of 1du/40 acres in this area. The Planning group suggests that water and slope will dictate the appropriate density whereas staff has proposed a low density (1du/ 40 acres) as a demarcation of the reality of the densities that would be attainable.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are primarily located east of the County Water Authority in areas that are groundwater dependent. Some referrals are located west of the County Water Authority and those changes will be made with the next iteration of the Land Use Map.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

JULIAN

Julian Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 3, 104

Community 2020 Target: 3, 100

Working Copy Population: 4, 200

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 17

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Sewer, septic and groundwater constraints. Most of the area's current systems are near or at capacity. Many wells in the area are going dry.
- Protection of steep slopes, ridgelines, and sensitive habitat.
- Maintaining agriculture.
- Impacts to community character from new development.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- The planning area has a small sewer district that serves the town center.
- Various groundwater-reliant water districts serve pockets of development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- In light of the 2000 Census information the Planning Group has re-evaluated the target population and changed it to 3,787. This represents a 1% annual growth rate by the year 2020.
- Since the Working Copy – December 2002 map was produced, the Planning Group has re-evaluated the 1 du/40 ac rural density in the area and recommends that it be re-designated as 1 du/80 ac. The Julian Community Planning Group, the Interest Group, and Staff agree on the land use distribution for the entire Julian Planning Group area. Staff has worked with the Planning Group and Interest Group to identify the 1du/80 acre modification. This revision will be reflected on the next iteration of the Working Copy.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

LAKESIDE/PEPPER DRIVE-BOSTONIA¹

Lakeside Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 72,370

Community 2020 Target: 85,754

Working Copy Population: 87,400

Planning Commission Referrals: 10

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 7

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining rural character.
- Undeveloped areas in the northern section of the community and within the Lakeside Multiple Species Conservation Program Archipelago.
- Existing semi-rural neighborhoods (Moreno Valley, Eucalyptus Hills, Blossom Valley, and Upper Rios Canyon) and existing agriculture areas in El Monte Valley.
- Open space buffers along community boundaries.
- Commercial businesses that reflect rural character.
- Local historic town center.
- Environmental resources (lake, river valleys and reservoir).
- Commercial and Industrial uses (location and amount).

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Lakeside's Village and Village Core are substantially built-out, and for that reason minimal change is proposed to the southwest portion of the community, which includes the densely developed Pepper Drive-Bostonia area (Village/Village Core densities). Higher densities were only applied to select parcels; additional high-density development would only be possible through a redevelopment program.
- Agricultural contracts / preservation at 1 du/10 ac densities.

¹ Includes a boundary adjustment that combines the Lakeside and Pepper Drive-Bostonia Planning Group areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The Planning Group supports the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions. Particular requests include maintaining the existing density of the Lakeside Archipelago and El Monte Valley, and eliminating High Meadows Ranch Specific Plan Area.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission referred 10 comments or requests to staff based on public testimony. Two addressed Planning Group issues (zoning consistency, High Meadows Ranch, and Multiple Species Conservation Program hard-line properties). One addressed a correction needed within the Lakeside Archipelago. Four requests were related to commercial or industrial use, which will be addressed in an upcoming Planning Group meeting. Three were related to previous residential density requests discussed in public meetings during earlier Planning Group reviews.

MOUNTAIN EMPIRE
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 101

Community 2020 Target: 361

Working Copy Population: 250

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 17

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining agriculture intensity.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining one dwelling unit per twenty and forty-acre densities.
- Recognized existing patterns of development and individual requests.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- One referral in an area near Interstate 8 and La Posta Road for which a property owner requested a Semi-Rural Designation.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ subarea does not include group quarters

BOULEVARD
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 1,513

Community 2020 Target²: 4,134

Working Copy Population: 2,850

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 4

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Rural character opens unique opportunities for the many recreational possibilities surrounding the area.
- Boulevard's natural resources are a valuable asset to its own quality of life, as well as the region.
- Commercial needs are satisfied by small businesses that work to maintain the common personality of the area. The new Casino gives rise to the issue of expanding the existing Village Core and commercial areas.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing crossroads of Highway 80, Highway 94, Ribbonwood Road and Interstate 8.
- Semi-Rural areas primarily reinforce the village of Boulevard area.
- Growth would predominantly occur in the Rural densities due to area predominately being designated Rural Lands.
- Buffers are established between the communities of Tierra del Sol, Boulevard and Live Oak Springs.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- The Boulevard Sponsor Group Chairperson, Donna Tisdale, submitted a letter in support of the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

² *community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors*

JACUMBA
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 660

Community 2020 Target²: 5,000

Working Copy Population: 3,400

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 8

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Allow for commercial and residential development to support the existing village of Jacumba.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing and historic development patterns of the village of Jacumba.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- The Boulevard Sponsor Group supports the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings without a formal vote.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

1 subarea does not include group quarters, but does include Jacumba Valley Ranch Specific Plan

2 community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

LAKE MORENA/CAMPO
Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 2,679

Community 2020 Target²: 4,640

Working Copy Population: 5,000

Planning Commission Referrals: 2

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 9

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining rural atmosphere.
- Limited growth should be targeted at the Cameron Corners village area.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in and around Cameron Corners at Highway 94 and Buckman Springs Road. Growth would predominantly occur in the existing village areas of Lake Morena, Campo, and target new growth in Cameron Corners due to lack of sewer availability.
- Separation between communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The Lake Morena Planning Group chairperson, Randy Lenac, verbally supported the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings with no formal vote from the group.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals were located near the proposed expansion of the Cameron Corners Village Core area.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ subarea does not include group quarters

² community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

POTRERO

Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 886

Community 2020 Target²: 1,525

Working Copy Population: 2,150

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 6

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Potrero is a self-determination community and is mostly satisfied with the existing General Plan designations.
- Physical, historic structures in Potrero not only contribute to the “country-life” feel of the area, but also to its sentimental appeal and strong roots.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village densities and uses for the community are located in the existing crossroads area at Highway 94 and Potrero Road.
- Preserved land for agricultural and residential uses by maintaining 10- and 20-acre densities along existing infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The Potrero Planning Group verbally supported the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings and with a formal vote with additional commercial recommendations.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ subarea does not include group quarters

² community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors

TECATE

Mountain Empire Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 156

Community 2020 Target²: 1,000

Working Copy Population: 450

Planning Commission Referrals: 3

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 2

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Reinforce and expand the existing Commercial and Industrial core areas at the border.
- Traffic – regional traffic commuting through community.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village and Semi-Rural densities and uses for the community are located in areas adjacent to the City of Tecate, Mexico.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing industrial and commercial uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Village/Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- The Tecate Sponsor Group Chairperson, Louis Schooler, verbally supported the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings with no formal vote from the Planning Group.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are located mostly along State Highway 188 (Tecate Road) and request extending commercial areas north of Tecate towards State Highway 94.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

² *community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors*

NORTH COUNTY METROPOLITAN
North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 28,914

Community 2020 Target: 52,967

Working Copy Population: 64,400

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 3

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Diverse area comprised of many small islands interspersed among the cities of Escondido, San Diego, San Marcos, Vista and Oceanside and large areas of steep rugged terrain and cultivated farmland.
- Varying levels of services available.
- Preservation of agriculture in areas adjacent to rapidly growing cities.
- Increased traffic throughout the sub-region.
- Annexations to adjacent cities of Escondido, San Diego, San Marcos, Vista and Oceanside.
- Possible plan boundary adjustment to add Harmony Grove area to San Dieguito Community Plan area. This issue will be discussed in the San Dieguito Planning area presentation. The population listed above includes the Harmony Grove area.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village Core and Village densities are located in those areas primarily west of I-15 where services, including access to public transportation, are available.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The referral was located in the area known as “Sunset Island” adjacent to the cities of Vista and Oceanside.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

HIDDEN MEADOWS

North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 6,329

Community 2020 Target: 10,000

Working Copy Population: 11,650

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 5

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Preservation of community character.
- Possible change in planning area boundary with Valley Center planning area.
- Traffic – elimination of SC990 to maintain current circulation pattern.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character.
- Lack of riding and hiking trails within the community.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village Core and Village densities are limited with the majority of uses serving the community located in the adjacent city of Escondido. There are numerous Specific Plans within this plan area. Specific plans such as Lawrence Welk Resort and Champagne Gardens provide services primarily for visitors to the area.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- On January 23, 2003, the Hidden Meadows Sponsor Group recommended the Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

TWIN OAKS
North County Metropolitan Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 2,501

Community 2020 Target²: 2,142

Working Copy Population: 3,750

Planning Commission Referrals: 3

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 21

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Preservation of rural lifestyle.
- Maintaining agriculture.
- Impacts to community character from new development in adjacent cities.
- Traffic – regional traffic commuting through community.
- Annexations not respecting surrounding character.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village Core and Village densities and uses for the community are located in the adjacent cities of Vista and San Marcos.
- Preserved land for agricultural uses by maintaining 1du/10-ac and 1du/20-ac densities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- No major issues identified. On August 22, 2002, the Twin Oaks Sponsor Group recommended the Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.
- It does not appear that Twin Oaks has taken a fair share of the population. Staff should work with the community to increase density with the emphasis on area adjacent to San Marcos in the South and the northern portion of the plan area. Two of the referrals are located in the northern portion of the plan area and the third referral is located in the central portion of the plan area.

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

- In applying the concepts, it appears there are dual objectives within Twin Oaks. Those objectives are the preservation of agriculture and increased density west of the water authority boundary. Twin Oaks is located adjacent to the City of San Marcos and is within the boundary of the County Water Authority. However, semi-rural lands containing residential and agricultural uses along with rural lands dominate this community. Much of the undeveloped areas contain steep slopes, sensitive biological habitat and poor access.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

² *community target established prior to 2000 census data*

NORTH MOUNTAIN
North Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 2,467

Community 2020 Target: 3,779

Working Copy Population: 5,250

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 3

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Protection of natural resources.
- Maintaining potential for agricultural uses.
- Equity mechanism for retaining property value.
- Recognition of existing commercial property.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- No application of Village Core or Village categories due to lack of existing development pattern, desire to limit growth, and the Forest Conservation Initiative (1993).
- Location (inefficient for infrastructure development) and environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Recognized significant existing commercial development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

PALOMAR MOUNTAIN
North Mountain Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population¹: 245

Community 2020 Target: 871

Working Copy Population: 500

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 3

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Protection of natural resources.
- Recognition of existing commercial property.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- No application of Village Core, Village, or Semi-Rural categories due to lack of existing development pattern, desire to limit growth, and the Forest Conservation Initiative (1993).
- Location (inefficient for infrastructure development) and environmental constraints determined density patterns.
- Recognized significant existing commercial development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- While this area has no official representation, the Palomar Mountain Planning Organization would like to see additional density and commercially designated parcels on Palomar Mountain. This option is precluded by the density restrictions placed on the area as a result of the Forest Conservation Initiative (1993).

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *subarea does not include group quarters*

OTAY
Otay Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 6,804

Community 2020 Target: 17,554

Working Copy Population: 16,150

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 0

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Majority of existing population related to two large detention facilities.
- Proximity to border crossing.
- Opportunity to develop heavy industry is unique to region.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Development potential is located on two specific plans: East Otay Mesa (commercial and industrial) and Otay Ranch (residential). Remainder of subregion is within public land.
- Parcels under private ownership and east of County Water Authority service boundary, reflect surrounding densities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/ Sponsor Group:

- No Planning/ Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

PALA/PAUMA
Pala/Pauma Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 6,156

Community 2020 Target: 7,000

Working Copy Population: 12,750

Planning Commission Referrals: 11

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 8

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintain agriculture.
- Minimize traffic-related issues on State Highway 76.
- Address watershed issues (protection of the San Luis Rey Watershed).
- Provide equity mechanisms or incentives for affected property owners.
- Implement a village center/San Luis Rey Riverwalk Corridor Plan.
- Preserve rural lifestyle/ character.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO THE MAP:

- Semi-Rural densities provide separation between the Pala/ Pauma and Valley Center Planning areas.
- Identified large acreages of sensitive biological habitat (Rancho Guejito).

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Sponsor Group:

- No major issues identified. On January 8, 2003, the Pala/Pauma Sponsor Group voted 5-0 to recommend that the Working Copy – December 2002 map, with modifications discussed with staff, be accepted for further testing and refinement.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission referrals are scattered throughout the Planning area (from west to east). All of the referrals focus on concerns with proposed density reductions.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

PENDLETON-DELUZ
Pendleton-DeLuz Subregional Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 36,927

Community 2020 Target¹: 34,976

Working Copy Population: 38,350

Planning Commission Referrals: 0

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 1

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Over 75% of the planning area is under the jurisdiction of the military (Camp Pendleton) with the vast majority of the area population located on base.
- Preservation of agriculture.
- Lack of services.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- There are no Village Core or Village densities within the Pendleton-DeLuz Planning area due to the lack of services and remoteness of the area.
- Semi-Rural areas reflect the existing agricultural uses and existing patterns of development. Growth would predominantly occur in the Semi-Rural densities due to lack of sewer availability.
- Santa Margarita River, upland habitats and watershed.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning/Sponsor Group Recommendation:

- No Planning/ Sponsor Group representation.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

¹ community target established prior to 2000 census data

RAINBOW
Rainbow Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 1, 843

Community 2020 Target: 2, 800

Working Copy Population: 3, 500

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 6

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Preservation of rural lifestyle/character.
- Maintaining agriculture.
- Groundwater contamination and quality.
- Traffic issues related to the California Highway Patrol checkpoint at the San Diego/Riverside County border.
- Public safety concerns on local roads.
- Fire hazards from excessive brush in the area.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Semi-Rural densities applied to the areas within or adjacent to the Rainbow Valley Boulevard area.
- Semi-rural densities were applied to the Rainbow Valley area to reflect existing parcelization, commercial and civic uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No major issues identified. The Planning Group recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map be accepted for further testing and refinement.

Planning Commission:

- The referral involves a request to enlarge an existing Commercial General Plan Designation to accommodate an on-site septic system and truck parking area. The subject property is located west of Interstate 15, south of the San Diego/Riverside County line.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

RAMONA
Ramona Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 33,407

Community 2020 Target: 52,043

Working Copy Population: 53,500

Planning Commission Referrals: 3

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 21

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining Rural Character.
- Traffic – Congestion on Highway 67 and within the town center.
- Existing infrastructure deficit; primarily roads and sewer.
- Protection of the Ramona Grasslands.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Village Core and Village densities and uses in the town center, where services are expected to be available. Tailored zoning will be developed to address local concerns about village densities. Town Center Design workshops will be held to create strategies for addressing community design issues in this area, including those related to traffic.
- Additional capacity in this community planning area due to proximity to western incorporated areas and subsequent infrastructure, as well as the area's location primarily within the County Water Authority service boundary.
- Mixed Use Overlay Zone may be applied to portions of the Village.
- Rural areas surround the community to the west, east, and south in order to protect natural resources and to avoid the need for excess infrastructure. A plan is currently being structured to permanently preserve the bulk of the Grasslands while accommodating appropriate development.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- Planning group and DPLU have worked together to develop a land use distribution recommendation that is mutually agreeable in most areas with a population capacity that is very near to the community population target. Additional modifications will be made based on recent recommendations of the Planning Group.

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

- The Ramona Grasslands Project is still in the conceptual phase and must be further developed before specific recommendations may be applicable.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are all located in the Barona Mesa area south of San Diego Country Estates.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

SAN DIEGUITO
San Dieguito Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 12,527

Community 2020 Target: 37,506

Working Copy Population¹: 34,050

Planning Commission Referrals: 4

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 7

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining rural estate character.
- Impact of population increase as vested Specific Plan areas develop.
- Traffic – primarily regional thru-traffic and traffic generated from locally developing Specific Plan areas.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- Proposed Harmony Grove village has the potential for Mixed Use Overlay Zone in the core area. Harmony Grove is located between incorporated urban jurisdictions with immediate freeway access. The village reflects the land use Concepts, consisting of a high-density core surrounded by core support and semi-rural densities. Sensitive areas will be protected with low densities. The rural community character will be retained through tailored zoning and design standards.
- Though adjacent to high-density development in neighboring jurisdictions, rural areas such as Elfin Forest are characterized by an existing low-density development pattern, steep slopes, high biological sensitivity, and limited roadway access and infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The San Dieguito Planning Group General Plan 2020 representative and Secretary, Lois Jones, verbally supported the Working Copy map with further testing and revisions for the Planning Commission hearings with no formal vote from the Planning Group.
- The Planning Group is exploring higher Semi-Rural densities primarily on the northern border of Elfin Forest to reduce property owner motivation to annex to San Marcos.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are primarily located within the Elfin Forest area with one property located in the Harmony Grove portion of San Dieguito.
- The Planning Commission recommends the December, 2002 Working Copy map for further testing and refinement.

¹ *population does not include Harmony Grove area; currently included in the North County Metropolitan subregional planning area*

SPRING VALLEY
Spring Valley Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 59,324

Community 2020 Target: 69,292

Working Copy Population: 67,700

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 6

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Impacts on community character and public services from increased development of low-income housing.
- Incompatible mix of land uses – undesirable commercial uses (auto repair, liquor stores, etc.) adjacent to residential uses.
- Lack of recreational parks and open space.
- Community's desire to incorporate.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO THE MAP:

- The community is one of the most densely populated areas in the unincorporated county so the majority of the planning area reflects existing development patterns of Village and Village Core.
- Existing patterns of development and land uses determined land use designations. Very few changes in density were made because the community is largely developed.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The Planning Group desires to retain existing general plan.

Planning Commission:

- The only referral requests that a residential designation be changed to light industrial.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

SWEETWATER
Sweetwater Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 12,951

Community 2020 Target: 16,303

Working Copy Population: 15,250

Planning Commission Referrals: 1

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 10

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Environmental impacts from the alignment and construction of the SR-125 toll road.
- Impacts to community character from rapid development in the City of Chula Vista.
- Local road congestion that has occurred as the number of commuters in surrounding jurisdictions has increased.
- Annexations that have physically divided the community and resulted in development that is inconsistent with community character.
- Desire to be removed from the City of Chula Vista's Sphere of Influence.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- The traditional services provided by a village core are located in the adjacent city of Chula Vista.
- Recognized existing land ownership – over half of the community planning area is designated Public/ Semi-public lands.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- No major issues identified. The Planning Group supports the Working Copy – December 2002 map with further testing and revisions.

Planning Commission

- The only referral is for a property owner who requests that a single parcel be changed from the existing density, which was retained by GP2020, to a much higher density.

GENERAL PLAN 2020 Community Summaries

- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

VALLE DE ORO
Valle de Oro Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 40, 035

Community 2020 Target: 45, 706

Working Copy Population: 42, 850

Planning Commission Referrals: 2

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 2

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintaining the existing general plan's development pattern, and
- Maintaining slope standards.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO MAP:

- The community is generally either built, preserved or in a specific plan area. The majority of the area in the Public/Semi-Public and Preserve Land designation is preserve. Much of the area's land use is determined by existing specific plans.
- Because of the strong desire of the community to keep the Existing General Plan, the slope dependent categories were retained in this community. This is an exception to the Land Use Framework.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- The Valle de Oro Planning Group supports the Working Copy – December 2002 map, but recommends changing open space areas from a designation of Public/Semi-Public and Preserve Lands to a new Open Space designation, which is identified in the Land Use Framework document. Staff supports the Planning Group recommendation.

Planning Commission:

- The referrals are for slightly higher density Semi-Rural designations in the eastern and southeastern portions of the Planning Area.
- The Planning Commission recommends the Working Copy – December 2002 map for further testing and refinement.

VALLEY CENTER
Valley Center Community Planning Area

2000 Census Population: 15,639

Community 2020 Target¹: 45,853

Working Copy Population: 38,300

Planning Commission Referrals: 17

Local Community Workshops and Meetings: 50

KEY COMMUNITY ISSUES:

- Maintain rural lifestyle/character.
- Traffic impacts to the local road network from development and surrounding Indian gaming facilities.
- How to preserve community character and the environment while protecting private property rights.
- Absence of equity mechanisms or incentives for affected property owners.
- Lack of local road connectivity.
- Lack of a municipal sewer system.
- Lack of affordable housing.
- County requirements for urban-style road standards.

COMMUNITY SPECIFIC CONDITIONS RELATED TO THE MAP:

- Higher residential densities (7.3 and 4.3 dus/ acre) are limited to the Village Residential areas (northern and southern Village nodes). Village Core and Village densities are designated within the historic town center providing an opportunity for municipal sewer system.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Planning Group:

- Currently, there is no consensus on the Working Copy – December 2002 map. The Valley Center Planning Group will conduct a special meeting on April 9, 2003 to revisit the Working Copy map. Staff will orally report the Planning Group's recommended changes to the Board of Supervisors.

Planning Commission:

- The Planning Commission referrals are located throughout the planning area. The majority of the referrals focus on concerns with proposed density reductions. The Planning Commission specifically directed staff to continue to coordinate with the Planning Group and the community to provide professional guidance regarding the Town Center planning workshops for the northern and southern Village nodes. Staff has tentatively scheduled a Town Center workshop for June 7, 2003 in Valley Center.

¹ *community target not yet endorsed by the Board of Supervisors*